DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 444 195 CS 510 371

AUTHOR	Li, Mingsheng
TITLE	Discourse and Culture of Learning--Communication Challenges.
PUB DATE	1999-11-27
NOTE	20p.; Paper presented at the Joint Meeting of the Australian Association for Research in Education/New Zealand Association for Research in Education (Melbourne, Victoria, Australia, November 29-December 3, 1999).
AVAILABLE FROM	http://www.swin.edu.au/aare/99pap/lim99015.htm.
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Case Studies; *Communication Problems; Communication Research; *Cultural Differences; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; Interpersonal Communication; *Second Language Learning; *Student Attitudes; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Student Relationship
IDENTIFIERS	China

ABSTRACT

It has been widely acknowledged in language acquisition research that cultural learning is an inseparable part of language learning. However, insufficient attention has been paid to the culture of classroom learning which involves both teachers' and learners' cultural values, beliefs, roles, expectations, and conceptions of teaching and learning. Communication challenges become obvious when teaching methodologies developed in one educational context are exported to another educational context. This paper reports on the findings from a case study conducted in 1997 in the People's Republic of China where pedagogical communication conflicts between English native speaking teachers and Chinese university English language majors became acute. The paper focuses on the problematic area--the discourse of participation that was highly valued, promulgated and practiced by native speakers teaching English in China. It will point out some of the discrepancies between this discourse and the Chinese culture of learning. In transplanting Western educational models to Chinese classrooms, participants did not sufficiently acknowledge the cultural distance between these models and the Chinese local sociocultural and educational realities. The discourse of participation was strongly resisted by Chinese students, and teaching by native speakers often failed to achieve the desired results. In spite of the "good" intentions on the part of both native teachers and Chinese students, there existed a vast gulf in their perceptions of what constituted "good" teaching and learning, of what appropriate roles they were fitted in, and what they expected of each other. The paper argues that the gulf, the hidden source of the pedagogical communication problems, can be bridged through creating a cultural synergy in which common interests are to be found and shared, sources of problems identified, cultural differences understood and respected, and learning maximally enhanced. (Contains 77 references and 2 tables of data.) (Author/RS)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

Paper presented at the Joint AARE-NZARE 1999 Conference in Melbourne

27th November – 2nd December, 1999

ED 444 195

Discourse and Culture of Learning -- Communication Challenges

Mingsheng Li (msheng@hotmail.com)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Graduate School of Education, La Trobe University

Bundoora, VIC 3083

M. Li

CS 510 371

Discourse and Culture of Learning -- Communication Challenges

Abstract

It has been widely acknowledged in language acquisition research that cultural learning is an inseparable part of language learning. However, insufficient attention has been paid to the culture of classroom learning which involves both teachers' and learners' cultural values, beliefs, roles, expectations, and conceptions of teaching and learning. Communication challenges become obvious when teaching methodologies developed in one educational context are exported to another educational context.

This paper reports on the findings from a case study conducted in 1997 in the People's Republic of China where pedagogical communication conflicts between English native speaking teachers and Chinese university English language majors became acute. The paper focuses on the problematic area -- the discourse of participation that was highly valued, promulgated and practised by native speakers teaching English in China. It will point out some of the discrepancies between this discourse and the Chinese culture of learning. In transplanting Western educational models to Chinese classrooms, participants did not sufficiently acknowledge the cultural distance between these models and the Chinese local socio-cultural and educational realities. The discourse of participation was strongly resisted by Chinese students and teaching by native speakers often failed to achieve the desired results. In spite of the "good" intentions on the part of both native teachers and Chinese students, there existed a vast gulf in their perceptions of what constituted "good" teaching and learning, of what appropriate roles they were fitted in, and what they expected of each other. The paper argues that the gulf, the hidden source of the pedagogical communication problems, can be bridged through creating a cultural synergy in which common interests are to be found and shared, sources of problems identified, cultural differences understood and respected, and learning maximally enhanced.

1.0 Introduction

Each year, thousands of expatriate English-speaking teachers are involved in English language teaching (ELT) programs in China. Their contribution to upgrading educational standards in the country is acknowledged by both Chinese individuals and government officials. However, serious problems have arisen in intercultural communication manifest in the direct transference of Western teaching methods to Chinese classrooms. The problems confronting expatriate teachers in China have hampered their efforts to introduce Western teaching methods to Chinese ELT profession and the value of expatriate involvement in English language teaching in China has been called into question. Yet many of these problems persist and remain unresolved. The cultural argument developed in this paper is based on a case study conducted in a southwestern province in China from March to May, 1997. This paper will explore the potential "stumbling blocks" (Barna, 1991, p. 345) in intercultural communication, as shown in expatriate teachers' pedagogical emphasis on the discourse of participation in an effort to involve Chinese students in group discussions, debates, and peer work.

2.0 A Cultural Argument

Culture influences people's perceptions, cognition, value systems, and ways of communication

(O'Sullivan, 1994; Young, 1996; Gudykunst, 1994; Barrow, 1990; Allwright, 1996; Brislin, 1993). Cultural codes, accepted as "regime of truth" (Popkewitz, 1987, p. 4), and therefore normative in nature, set dominant interpretative frames for the perceptions and understandings of events and new information (Young, 1996; Scollon & Scollon, 1995; Ryan, 1998; Gadman, 1997; Ellsworth, 1997). Modes of communication are socio-culturally shaped (Gudykunst, 1994; Young, 1996) and cultural differences, therefore, often become potential sources of miscommunication as participants make sense of their interactions by using different interpretative frameworks (Austin, 1998; Chang, 1996; Young, 1996). It is especially true of intercultural communication where "the problem for intercultural understanding then becomes a problem of incommensurability between sets of rules" (Young, 1996, p. 35), and where people's behavior does not seem to conform to existing values, beliefs, roles, and expectations (Cortazzi, 1990; Lutz, 1990; Giroux, 1992; Gudykunst, 1994). In intercultural communication, conflicts become inevitable in spite of the good intentions of all participants (Orton, 1990; Ryan, 1998). Disparities in interpretation are likely to lead to different understandings and expectations in the interactional process in which different participants "create, relate, organize and realize meaning" (Riley, 1985, p. 2).

Between teachers and students, there exists a role boundary which seriously influences teacher-student roles and expectations (Wright, 1987, 1990; Cortazzi & Jin, 1996; Craig, 1995), and role conflicts are bound to arise when the boundary is breached and expectations unfulfilled (Coleman, 1996; Cortazzi, 1990; Widdowson, 1987; Lutz, 1990; Hofstede, 1986; Kramsch, 1994). These culturally-based expectations, derived from social norms and communication rules, intergroup attitudes and stereotypes, are rarely explicitly articulated (Coleman, 1996; Gudykunst, 1994; Nunan, 1996; Cortazzi, 1990). However, both teachers and students judge the appropriateness of their actions on the basis of these expectations. Cortazzi (1990) maintains that it is the degree of proximity of the congruence of teacher-student expectations that plays a significant role in the success or failure of language teaching and learning. The congruence, however, is difficult to achieve as teachers and students rarely share a common "agenda", even in the same culture, let alone across different cultures (Edge, 1996). Consequently, dissonance is highly likely as all participants tend to perceive one another's behavior as "illogical", "vague", and "unclear" (Coleman, 1996, p. 8).

Such dissonance has been reported by many expatriate teachers teaching English in China (Morrison, 1989; Orton, 1990; McIlwraith, 1996; Ford, 1988; Porter, 1990; Light & Works, 1984; Sampson, 1984). Teacher-student conflicts sometimes create a "wall" between expatriate teachers and Chinese students (Murray, 1982; Orton, 1990; Morrison, 1989; McKnight, 1994). As a result, the good intentions embraced by all parties seem to have been thwarted (Booz, 1983; Porter, 1990; McIlwratih, 1996; Wan, 1997; Li, 1998). Some expatriate teachers go to China in high spirits, but come back home disappointed, frustrated, and hostile (Maley, 1986; Porter, 1990; McIlwraith, 1996). The Chinese host institutions also seem to be unhappy with the technological transference and expatriate teachers' pedagogical practices (Yu, 1984; Cortazzi & Jin, 1996; Zhang, 1996; Wan, 1997; Li, 1998). English teaching pedagogies developed in and monopolized by the West have become problematic in their implementation in the Chinese educational contexts (Burnaby & Sun, 1989; Pennycook, 1994; McKnight, 1994; Craig, 1995; Scollon & Scollon, 1995; Rao, 1996; Wan, 1997; Wen & Johnson, 1997).

The most controversial issue in expatriates' teaching is the discourse of participation which has been highly valued, promulgated, and practised by expatriate language teachers in China (Cortazzi & Jin, 1996; Wan, 1997; Li, 1998). The discourse is often seen in China as exotic and students often become confused with what the teacher expects of them in a seemingly unsupportive environment where conversations, discussions, debates and participation become the dominant mode of teaching (Sun, 1990; Craig, 1995; Caiger et al., 1996; Wan, 1997). Originating from the Western culture of learning, the discourse becomes problematic in the Chinese educational contexts, where the authoritative discourse is stressed and the primary role of a teacher as an authority is to teach while the major role of a student is to receive, absorb,

and digest the knowledge transmitted by the teacher (Cortazzi & Jin, 1996; Holliday, 1997; Wan, 1997; Burnaby & Sun, 1989; Scollon & Scollon,1995; Craig,1995; Lewin et al., 1994; Paine, 1990, 1992). Chinese students are pulled and pushed by conflicting ideologies and different sets of goals in choosing the most appropriate forms of discourse because every so often "the education or experience which is valued in one system is devalued in one or more of the other systems to which a person belongs" (Scollon & Scollon, 1995, p. 204). Fighting against Chinese tradition and trying to change Chinese cultural values to fit Western models can become a violent cultural imposition and can be counterproductive (Sampson, 1984; Gardner, 1989; Orton, 1990; Garrott, 1992, 1995; Hird, 1996; Cortazzi & Jin, 1996).

3.0 The Study

The aim of this study is to identify the possible sources of misunderstandings in intercultural communication and the kinds of communication breakdown by examining the discourse of participation emphasized by expatriate teachers in ELT in China and the Chinese students' responses to the discourse. Two contrary discourses – that of authority and participation – emerge clearly as categories in the interviewees' accounts to the questions which were not pre-emptive.

3.1 Location

A survey was conducted in nine universities in a southwestern province in the People's Republic of China from March to May, 1997.

3.2 Instruments

In this survey, questionnaires, interviews, group discussions were used as data-collecting instruments, but for the purpose of this paper only the interview data (conducted in Mandarin for Chinese teachers and students and in English for expatriate teachers) will be provided together with a small portion of the data from the questionnaire (in Mandarin) to which 302 students majoring in English responded. All interviews lasted from 30 to 60 minutes each, were audio-taped, transcribed, and checked by Chinese and English native speakers.

3.3 Subjects

Forty Chinese students, all English majors at tertiary levels, were interviewed. They were randomly selected for the semi-structured interviews. All had been taught by expatriate teachers at tertiary level for between one year to four years.

Ten Chinese teachers of English working in the universities were involved in the survey. They had all been taught by expatriate English language teachers in their undergraduate and postgraduate days and were teaching at tertiary levels in the province.

Fourteen expatriate teachers participated in the survey. Eight held relevant qualifications in ESL/EFL, English literature, education, and applied linguistics. Their teaching experience in China ranged from eight months to six years.

For the purposes of clarity and brevity in this paper, each expatriate teacher will be identified as Expatriate Teacher 1 (ET1), Expatriate Teacher 2 (ET2), and each Chinese teacher and student will be identified as Chinese Teacher 1 (CT1), Chinese Teacher 2 (CT2), and Chinese Student 1 (CS1), Chinese Student 2 (CS2), and so on, respectively. The number refers to the interview order of each research subject.

4.0 Results

4.1 The Rationale of the Discourse of Participation

It was the intention of many expatriate teachers to try to create an interactive atmosphere to enable students to become involved in the classroom activities. Most expatriate teachers believed that language acquisition could not occur without involving students in spontaneous interactions, such as group work, discussions, debates and role plays by creating a democratic setting and by giving students autonomy to learn the language through participation. ET3, ET7 and ET8 pointed out that the interactive approach they used was situation-based rather than text-based, and therefore it emphasized spontaneity in classroom activities rather than lock-step teaching. As a result, ET7 held that well-structured and systematic teaching was neither important nor necessary because structures could "inhibit the communication" and spontaneity. The intention of employing the interactive approach was to develop students' oral fluency through verbal participation and to overcome Chinese students' habits of rote memorization and passivity in their learning by providing them with maximum opportunities to practise the language (ET1; ET3; ET4; ET7; ET13). Expatriate teachers saw prescribed textbooks and procedural teaching as a barrier to effective interaction (ET2; ET4; ET5; ET6; ET7; ET13; ET14). In their view, students' success in learning is not measured by their acquired linguistic knowledge, but by the degree and scope of their participation (ET5; ET6; ET9) and students are expected to conform to expatriate teachers' cultural models (ET5; ET7). According to ET5, Chinese instructional modes stifled students' creativity in language learning, and the sole solution to the problem lay in the introduction of the Western mode of teaching, especially the discourse of participation. Some teachers confirmed that they had used the interactive teaching approach in all subjects and they expressed their disgust toward any form of lectures or any lock-step teaching (ET4; ET5; ET6; ET7; ET13). The ability to organize interactive activities appears to have become a touchstone of teaching quality and a symbol of modernity and Western technology (ET3; ET4; ET5; ET13; ET14). How Chinese students responded to the interactive teaching approach is essential to successful implementation of the approach.

4.2 Chinese Students' Responses

A large majority of expatriate teachers found it extremely difficult to implement the interactive approach (ET6; ET11; ET12, for example) because of Chinese students' reserved personalities (ET6) and their cultural perceptions of the teacher-student roles (ET12; ET14). In the experience of ET12, the success was very limited as the Chinese students were reluctant to participate in group work, discussions, and role plays. Similarly, ET11 noticed that the discourse of participation he adopted in his teaching was at great variance with Chinese traditional teacher-student role expectations. He reported that the interactive teaching approach was strongly rejected by Chinese students who remained silent most of the time, waiting for the teacher to deliver lectures in a systematic way, and refusing to get involved in discussions and group work. He recognized that

> Some of the classes you walk in you feel there is tension in the room, the relationship between the students is not good. And interactive methods don't work every well in those type of classes.

Having been taught by expatriate teachers for seven years at tertiary level, a Chinese teacher (CT7) expressed her disappointment with expatriate teachers' ritualized teaching modes: "they came to the class, handed out some papers, and asked the students to discuss the topics in the papers." She maintained that she had learned almost nothing from these expatriate teachers in spite of their good intentions and dedication to their teaching. CT5 felt unfortunate because she had never met a "good" expatriate teacher in her university life. It seemed to her that in whatever subjects these teachers taught, they did not seem to have a large range of teaching methods and skills to help them cope with their teaching in China except their teaching rituals -- group work, discussions, games, and role plays -- which she believed were not "teaching" in a formal sense.

As the discourse of participation emphasizes student-student interaction and spontaneity in the process, many Chinese students felt disoriented. As a result, expatriate teachers' classes were interpreted as "messy", "disorganized", "incoherent", "unsystematic", and "irresponsible". The interactive teaching approach, in the opinion of CS11, emphasized too much on the "superficial" to care about learner needs. She felt bitter because the students were compelled to attend expatriate teachers' classes that were boring, time-consuming and time-wasting. CS10 depicted an expatriate teacher's teaching of English literature as a "deceitful" action in which the teacher asked the students to discuss the themes of the literary pieces that the students had scant knowledge of, but the teacher always refused to offer his views. The classroom spontaneity orchestrated by expatriate teachers gave Chinese students an impression that expatriate teachers never prepared their lessons, just as CS12 pointed out:

> To these foreign teachers, teaching is but to interact, and to chat, to talk. It seems as if as long as you can speak a few simple words, that is the end of their teaching. This is a blunder. Teaching is different from chat. Students' language competence cannot develop from such simplistic teaching methods. .... We have lost our interest in their teaching because what we have been offered are the very basic things we learned in our primary or secondary schools. Their teaching cannot help us reach a high level, in whatever sense.

A large number of the students were extremely unhappy with expatriate teachers who, having underestimated the students' actual language proficiency, treated them like children in kindergartens, rather than university students with adult brains and intelligence. CS23 said,

> I begin to doubt about these foreign teachers' paper qualifications. The way they treat us is similar to that in Chinese kindergartens. We are shown some alphabetical letters and some photos and then we are invited to make some comments.

CS35 felt very sad because students' precious time was wasted on doing the games and role plays demanded by expatriate teachers. CS39 was sure that "these foreign teachers are deliberately fooling us."

As the discourse of participation tended to shift the formal classroom atmosphere to an informal one, Chinese students did not feel comfortable with expatriate teachers' casual behavior in the classroom, where a hierarchical teacher-student relationship was the norm (ET3; ET4; ET12). CS25 was shocked to see that expatriate teachers did not pay much attention to their classroom behavior, which might be inappropriate in the Chinese cultural contexts. CS23 felt that he could not bear such behaviors deviating too far from what was expected. It was observed by some Chinese students (CS8; CS9; CS10; CS11; CS35; CS36; CS37;

CS38; CS39) that some expatriate teachers were not serious in their teaching and they behaved like "clowns" in the classroom: wearing slippers and dirty and worn clothes, pounding the desk, tossing the chalk, chewing the gum, whistling, squatting on the podium, sitting on the desk, stepping on their benches, screaming out of the blue, singing songs, becoming angry easily, making students the targets of their own amusement, and looking down upon them. CS23 reported,

> In China, normally teachers stand while lecturing. The foreign teacher, however, does not have any good demeanor. While teaching, he sometimes stands, sometimes sits down [in his chair]. Sometimes, he climbs to the top of the podium and crosses his legs. I know these are but minor things, but I cannot tolerate such classroom behaviors.

A similar case was also reported in other interviews with expatriate teachers. ET4 observed,

> I know one of the [expatriate] teachers who had problems and used to come into the classroom, put his feet on the table and eat in front of his students while he was teaching. Personally I find that unacceptable. But in China, this is even, obviously, far more unacceptable.

ET4 noted that the Chinese students, from a hierarchical society where the teacher is respected for being both an authority and a role model, often felt uncomfortable with such informal and casual behaviors. CS26 complained that expatriate teachers behaved so lightly and so casually in their teaching that it seemed as if they were "taking a stroll in a bazaar", suggesting that such classroom behavior was not aligned with Chinese cultural traditions. CS35 was convinced that such casual behavior was common among expatriate teachers. ET9 described his classroom episodes as follows:

> I have tried, attempted to make classes interesting. I turned to be an actor at times. I quite often do foolish things, which I designed to get the students to realize I am human, to make them laugh, to get them to talk to you.

The teacher's self-mockery, which might be amusing for the students to watch, might not communicate the intended message to the students, who might interpret such classroom behavior as an improper demeanor in a cultural context where teachers are held as role models.

Cultural variance in role prescriptions led to confusion and misunderstanding. Seeing the classroom norms being violated, the students were frustrated and responded negatively to expatriate teachers' teaching (CS1; CS2; CS12). CT3 pointed out that students' failure to appreciate the expatriate teachers' classroom behavior could seriously affect their learning. She observed:

> The students can feel frustrated in the classes taught by expatriate teachers who fail to quickly adapt themselves to different cultural norms. The reward for the teachers' efforts and their active involvement in teaching is nothing but misunderstanding, bewilderment and an unwillingness to cooperate.

Violation of classroom norms could lead to teacher-student tensions (ET3; ET4; ET12). The problem is that these expatriate teachers did not realize that they had violated these class norms (CT1; CT3).

As expatriate teachers were preoccupied with group work and discussions, they tended to focus their attention on those who could speak better English, while forgetting those who could not express themselves well (CS39; CS40). CS35 reported that

> We have been taught by five expatriate teachers already, but many of our classmates have never spoken a word with them.

Such teaching activities, which favored only a limited few, often failed to attend to the interests of a large majority of the class (CT4; CT5; CT7). CS26 was angry because the expatriate teachers were often monopolized by a few students, while many others were sidelined in the classroom group activities. Such a monopoly was psychologically devastating to the enthusiasm and the self-esteem of those who were marginalised (CS8; CS39). CS8 and CS30 felt wrathful because some male expatriate teachers tended to shower their favoritism exclusively on the beautiful girls while the males and other ordinary female students were forgotten.

Most students agreed that they could not learn much from expatriate teachers' teaching that put too much emphasis on interactions and involvement. Their expectations of what a teacher should be were violated and thus frustration became inevitable. ET12 pointed out, as the Chinese students expected their expatriate teachers to lecture most of the time in front of them as the transmitter of knowledge that needed to be known, expatriate teachers' direct transplanting of the interactive approach was indeed quite unsuccessful. Sensing that the expected knowledge was not transmitted, he noted that these students, having been socialized in their culture of learning, responded negatively to the teaching.

Chinese students' satisfaction with expatriates' teaching was found to be negatively correlated with the length of students' exposure to teaching. Students' levels of dissatisfaction rose with the increase of exposure to expatriate teachers' teaching (see Table 1). Learner dissatisfaction led the students to believe that expatriate teachers' teaching was a waste of time and energy and that they could not learn much in expatriate teachers' classes. The higher the levels of the students, the more they were certain that expatriate teachers' teaching could not lead to high proficiency in English. A majority of students from Year Two to Year Four believed that they could learn more in Chinese teachers' classes than in expatriate teachers' classes.

Length of Exposure Agree or Strongly Agree (%)	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
Expatriate teachers' English teaching is disappointing.	1.9%	25.9%	35.5%	56.4%
Expatriate teachers' classes waste time and energy.	1.9%	21.0%	21.8%	35.5%
I cannot learn much in expatriate teachers' classes.	5.7%	21.0%	28.1%	46.8%
Expatriate teachers' teaching cannot lead to high proficiency.	23.1%	34.6%	35.1%	61.3%
I can learn more in Chinese teachers' classes than in expatriate teachers' classes.	48.1%	58.0%	63.6%	91.9%

Table 1

The students changed their perceptions of expatriate teachers' teaching from relatively positive to negative with increasing exposure. In other words, the students' satisfaction was negatively related to the length of the exposure to expatriate teachers' teaching. Resistance increased in accordance with the increase in exposure.

In addition to dissatisfaction with expatriate teachers' teaching and some of their culturally inappropriate classroom behaviors, Chinese students, teachers and administrators were unhappy with some of the topics chosen by expatriate teachers for classroom discussions. In order to maintain the dynamics of the discourse of participation, some expatriate teachers tended to use current politically sensitive themes for discussions: such as the students' attitudes towards the Chinese Communist Party, towards the current Chinese leaders, towards the Chinese birth control policies and human rights (CT1; CT4; CT5). Unlike the cultural contexts in Australia where a particular political leader, or a particular party can be mocked at (ET4), ridiculing a specific political figure or a party, or government policy in China could lead to serious consequences which students made attempts to avoid. Some expatriate teachers, failing to understand the cultural differences and gender issues, involved students in discussing some anti-traditional and anti-cultural themes such as freedom of sex, pre-marital sex, promiscuous sex, gay and lesbian cultures which were utterly inappropriate and unacceptable in the Chinese classroom and in the Chinese cultural contexts (CT1; CT8; CT9; CS27; CS29). These anti-China and anti-cultural classroom themes, at least in the Chinese perceptions, violated teachers' prescribed roles -- as teachers to teach the language rather than to engage students in discussions of political and sexual issues. Stepping out of the role boundary created serious cultural and political concerns on the part of the Chinese administrators (CT10; CS40).

In response to expatriate teachers' preoccupation with the discourse of participation, Chinese students, in spite of their eagerness to learn the language and their desire to interact with native speakers, began to absent themselves from expatriate teachers' classes by pretending to be sick (CS17; CS18; CS19; CS38; CS39; CS40). According to CS7, most students would respond negatively to expatriate teachers' teaching by finding excuses to absent themselves from classes, in defiance of the advice by the departmental administrators that students should respect expatriate teachers and attend their classes. According to CS40, only one third of the thirty-nine students in her class attended the expatriate teachers' class. Absenteeism, an indicator of students' negative attitudes towards teaching, had become a serious problem in expatriate teachers' classes (CS11; CS35; CS40). In some universities, the departmental administrators seemed to turn a blind eye to the fact, which was too familiar and too routine for them to bother trying to remedy (CS7; CS35; CS39).

Absenteeism and the excuse of being sick are often signs of resistance to teaching. This communication style, however, is rarely noticed by expatriate teachers. ET9, for example, was surprised that "there are a lot of students who are apparently sick". He failed to realize that learner resistance had already begun to build up although he was being provided with very positive feedback about his teaching. He, like some other expatriate teachers, failed to interpret the meaning of the feedback in Chinese cultural settings.

Almost all the expatriate teachers participating in the survey reported that they often used various instruments, such as dialogues, surveys and journals, to obtain feedback about their teaching from the students. They were all happy with their own teaching because, in their interpretations, all the feedback was positive. However, they often failed to correctly interpret the culturally-loaded and deceptive messages from the feedback and as a result their ritualized teaching continued as usual with little knowledge that their teaching was not very much appreciated. For example, ET13 reported using students' journals to get feedback about the expatriate teachers' teaching in the department. His confidence was doubly reassured by the positive feedback from the students and he was given an impression that expatriate teachers' teaching in the department was highly appreciated by the students because the response in the journals did not contain anything negative. He was so sure of his success that he vowed to leave the teaching profession if 10% of the students in the department would say that they could not learn much from the expatriate teachers. He said that he had recognized the problems in other institutions where expatriate teachers' teaching was not welcomed by the students, but he was absolutely sure this was not the case in his department where every expatriate teacher was a devoted professional.

Yet, from the same institution, the students' views about expatriate teachers' teaching from the questionnaires in this survey differed widely from his own perception (see Table 2): 36.3% of students were disappointed with expatriate teachers' teaching; 24.5% felt their teaching was a waste of time; 45.1% believed that their teaching was not up to their expectations. There existed a mismatch between this teacher's perceptions and the perceptions of the students.

The responses of the students from the university where the expatriate teacher was working were as follows

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Expatriate teachers' teaching is disappointing.	9.8%	26.5%	21.6%	34.3%	7.8%
Expatriate teachers' classes are a waste of time and energy.	8.8%	15.7%	21.6%	38.2%	15.7%
The more we expect from expatriate teachers, the more we feel disappointed.	15.7%	29.4%	23.5%	30.4%	1.0%

Table 2

This expatriate teacher, like many others, saw only the tip of the iceberg, but failed to see the substance below the surface -- cultural implications involved in interpersonal communication patterns. He failed to obtain reliable information from the students' journals because the students, possibly having realized that their feedback might bring about reprisal from the teachers (especially when the people responding could be identified), had not provided any negative response.

5.0 Discussion

The study suggests that there exists a vast discrepancy between the culture of teaching on the part of the expatriate teachers who put strong emphasis on the discourse of participation and the culture of learning on the part of the Chinese students who were accustomed to the discourse of teacher authority. Cultural factors play a crucial part in participants' perceptions of their individual roles based on their cultural mindsets. These perceptions ultimately determine the styles of communication. Miscommunication occurs when different participants read the "text" differently.

In the view of ET3, some expatriate teachers, "with only half-developed ideas of what their role is", were attempting to change the attitudes of the Chinese students and teachers by imposing their teaching models on the Chinese culture of learning without considering the cultural compatibilities and contextual appropriateness. CT2 believed that direct transference of Western teaching methods without adaptation could disappoint and frustrate Chinese students, and expatriate teachers as well. Although some expatriate teachers, like ET3, ET4, ET12, ET14, made some adjustments to their teaching methods, Chinese students still found them too Western to be accepted (CS8; CS12; CS22; CS39; CS40). The discrepancy in expectations has created problems in intercultural communication between expatriate teachers and Chinese students. Communication breakdown occurred between expatriate teachers and Chinese students when they failed to understand and share their differences and had difficulties crossing the cultural divide to share each other's views. Misunderstandings and breakdown in intercultural communication arise as each

participant naively assumes that "there are sufficient similarities among peoples of the world to make communication easy" (Barna, 1991, p. 345). Such an assumption is based on a taken-for-granted "clock logic" (Gadman, 1997, p. 21) that shapes people's ways of thinking in absolute certainty, leaving no room for creativity and differences within the kingdom of the clock. In implementing the discourse of participation, the following ideas should be taken into consideration.

Firstly, expatriate teachers, while emphasising the importance of learner participation, may have failed to recognise that such teaching styles may not be appropriate for all aspects of English. Some aspects involve fewer conversations and learner participation than others. Expatriate teachers, as the survey data show, made every attempt to engage students in group activities in almost all courses. Besides, the discourse seems to contradict the fact that English is taught as a subject in China rather than as a mere instrument for communication. As a disciplinary subject, every aspect of the language is to be studied thoroughly, for example: lexicology, phonology, morphology, syntax, discourse, stylistics, and literary conventions. The discourse seems to emphasise a very narrow aspect of language-- oracy, and ignores other aspects of linguistic needs. Furthermore, implicit in the discourse of participation is the notion that in language learning, the primary aim is the negotiation of ideas in the learning context. That is, the ideas embedded in the content, be it a written text or something out of the teacher's head, are more important than linguistic forms and the cultural inputs that convey those ideas. The discourse, however, fails to recognise that in language learning, it is not ideas, important as they are, but the linguistic forms and cultural connotations that are used to represent these ideas that students need. It is the language itself that is the learning object, not the ideas prompted in group and peer work. The purpose of group work and discussions is to serve the learning object -- language. Putting students in groups to "discuss" the ideas prescribed by the teacher is not enough to ensure linguistic and academic progress in all areas, and group work or peer work alone cannot help learners to attend to linguistic forms. Over-emphasis on the discourse is likely to ignore the importance of students' internalisation of L2 rules and structures, which is the priority of language learning.

Secondly, large class-sizes, ranging from 30 to 40 (ET8, ET9) may present difficulties for expatriate teachers attempting to undertake group work and discussions. Students are crowded in one room, without much space for group activities. Besides, the large class size requires teachers to have good organising abilities and students to be willing to participate. Many complaints from students were about expatriate teachers' inability to organise the classroom activities and their unfair treatment of particular students (CS35-40). The two-hour period was considered precious time for them to listen to the native speaker, and they were very unhappy to be divided into groups to be fed with large doses of ungrammatical English from their peers, while seeing the teacher, apparently idling in the classroom or being monopolised by a limited few (CS35). The class size seems to have raised the question about the limitations of importing into large classes instructional management techniques originating in Western contexts of small and medium classes.

Thirdly, the discourse becomes an implicit threat to Chinese students' self-concept and "the maxim of modesty" (Tsui, 1996, p. 158), which prevents self-assertiveness -- by subjecting them to testing and negative evaluation by the teachers and their peers. Involving Chinese students in group activities and discussions would generate anxieties, fears, and frustration, and ultimately teacher-student tensions, a counter-productive effect of the interactive approach, which emphasises learning in a less stressful environment.

Fourthly, the Chinese tradition pays much more attention to written discourse than the discourse of participation (Pennycook, 1994). The interactive approach adopted by expatriate teachers emphasises learner participation and values oral expressions while the Chinese culture "does not necessarily see oral communication as prime, where there is a long tradition of the valuing of written language" (Holliday,

1997, p. 415). One of the reasons that expatriate teachers' teaching in China were accused of being unsystematic, disorganised, and shallow (CS30) was the fact that expatriate teachers put much emphasis on learner participation and ignored the importance of written discourse. The Chinese students were accustomed to text-oriented teaching modes and to the quantifiable measuring of their progress by the coverage of textbooks (Brick, 1991). It seemed to them that systematic knowledge was embedded in the textbook and could be transmitted to the students by the teacher's careful and detailed explanations. Involving students in group work seemed to waste their time that was needed for internalising linguistic forms (CS8; CS9; CS39).

Fifthly, expatriate teachers did not use textbooks, because textbooks were seen as an obstacle to teachers' classroom creativity and spontaneity in interactive classes (ET5; ET6; ET8). Learning without textbooks gave students a sense of insecurity and anxiety (CS3; CS8; CS12). Teaching without any handouts or texts denied the students the opportunity to enhance the visual picture of linguistic and lexical forms and thus constrained the students' linguistic internalisation. That teaching in China emphasises the use of textbooks and visual processing, rather than verbal skills, may be associated with Chinese orthography in which form and meaning are closely related (Hoosain, 1986) and readers' comprehension relies heavily on visual spatial information in the printed texts (Chen, 1996). As a result, according to Hoosain (1986), Chinese students' visual discrimination and space conceptualisation are better than their verbal ability. The discourse of participation that emphasises much on verbal skills put Chinese students on a difficult learning situation.

Finally, the rationale of the discourse of participation is learner autonomy (Ho & Crookall, 1995; Nunan, 1995). Learners are required to be responsible for their own learning while the teacher's role is facilitative rather than authoritarian. This concept seems to contradict the Chinese culture of learning in which the teacher's authoritative role is emphasized (Paine, 1990; Brick, 1991; Cortazzi & Jin, 1996). In such a culture, teachers are seen as authorities, transmitters, and arbiters of knowledge (Ho & Crookall, 1995; Orton, 1990; Hong, 1993; Brick, 1991). Having been socialized into the Chinese culture of learning, it is not easy for the Chinese students to dramatically change their role conceptions to accept autonomy (Ho & Crookall, 1995; Cortazzi & Jin, 1996). The discourse of participation is therefore culturally incompatible with the discourse of authority. Yet forcibly changing Chinese students' mindsets to fit into expatriate teachers' cultural frameworks seems to be an extremely difficult task.

6.0 Cultural Synergy -- A Proposal

The survey data have indicated that there exists an invisible boundary between Chinese students and expatriate teachers in their interpretation of their individual roles and role expectations. Each seems too deeply involved in their own interpretation of the pedagogic worlds based on their cultural values, perceptions, subjectivities and "scripted" routine behaviors to care about border crossing.

However, the data have also indicated that many Chinese students began to observe the positive side of the participatory discourse and that expatriate teachers also recognized the disadvantages of the discourse and the advantages of Chinese teaching methods derived from the Chinese cultural values and beliefs. Expatriate teachers' classes were believed to be very active, lively, and informative (CS1; CS4; CS5; CS6; CT1; CT2; CT3; CT7). It is a consensus among Chinese that the presence of expatriate teachers can help create an authentic language learning environment which may be difficult or impossible for Chinese teachers to create. Expatriate teachers "play an indispensable role as living-speaking-gesturing models" (ET4), provide students with new modes of learning a good language learning environment (ET1), help promote students' "cultural understanding and higher

levels of performance in pronunciation, aural and oral English as well as writing" (ET9), and enliven the language learning atmosphere by bringing into the classroom a new culture of learning (CT1).

Similarly, some expatriate teachers began to realize that there was much more in the Chinese culture of learning as shown in Chinese students' learning success than it appeared to them at first sight. An expatriate teacher was very much surprised to find that,

> My first surprise was how eager, clever, and willing the students were to study the English language scientifically. In other words, they proved to be very excellent students of the language, over, above my expectation. They far surpassed even my best students in the United States in terms of sheer curiosity and interest, and willingness to approach the language as a science and learn it from inside out, and not just the casual learning of the language as something they would pick up in streets. They wanted to know grammatical reasons. For structure they wanted to know the syntax. They wanted to know the structure, and all of the culture and customs behind many of the stories.

He observed that in spite of the poor learning conditions, the students had been learning the language successfully in "a very very fine educational system that taught what they needed to know." He said that he came to China with a "myth" that he could help China modernize its university system, but very quickly discovered that "I had much more to learn than to teach."

The teacher-student clashes reported in this survey remain largely with the teachers' selection of the discourse that is incompatible with Chinese culture of learning. Teachers and students did not seem to communicate at the same level of understanding. Therefore, it is important that both expatriate teachers and Chinese students develop cultural sensitivities to enable them to cross cultural borders made up of intersubjectivities, and to share each other's views, learn from each other, respect each other's differences, and form an alliance to achieve their ultimate shared goals by forsaking their clock logic and "we've-got-it-right" attitudes.

Such an environment could be created if different cultures of learning might be combined in a synergetic culture in which both teachers and learners from different cultures are engaged in a process of mutual learning to understand each other's cultural values, beliefs, and role expectations "without loss of their own cultural status, role or identity" (Cortazzi & Jin, 1996, p. 201), by identifying differences in cultures of learning, making explicit the hidden curriculum, and articulating their expectations of each other. A synergetic culture encourages the fostering of attitudes to learn, to tolerate, to reflect, to adapt, and to assimilate. It may help expatriate teachers "to open their conceptual and methodological gates and to make 'trespassers' welcome" (Firth & Wagner, 1998, p. 93), to constantly examine their pedagogies to ensure that what is transferred is meaningful in particular contexts, and to understand and deal with students' subjectivities, their cultural positions, their lived experiences, and the intricacies of different discourses in the local culture (Pennycook, 1994). At the same time, it may empower students to "draw upon and investigate their own cultural resources and investigate other knowledge claims" (Pennycook, 1990, p. 311) and challenge their existing beliefs and assumptions derived from their own culture of learning. Understanding expatriate teachers' culture of learning will equip the students with alternatives and promote their learning by adopting different learning options. Fossilized learning habits and a poor ability to tolerate new and conflicting conceptions may not lead to border crossing, nor to cross-cultural understandings. Students should actively reach out to expatriate teachers and share some part of their "territories". Without such a move, without a cooperative environment, expatriate teachers' intentions to cross the border and to transform the status quo may not achieve much success. Both expatriate teachers and Chinese students need to make an effort to accommodate each other's views, to tolerate the differences, to narrow the gulf in

their fundamental assumptions about teaching and learning, and to find ways to address any problems and misunderstandings. In the process of border crossing, however, teachers play a primary role in reaching out to students and taking a further step to understand the student's culture. McLaughlin (1995) emphasizes that it is "professionally irresponsible"(p. 112) to assume that only students had to adapt and accommodate while academics insist on maintaining their positions. The establishment of a synergetic culture will, it is hoped, help the participants clear the stumbling blocks in intercultural communications, especially in language teaching and learning in cross-cultural settings.

7.0 Conclusion

Communication challenges become obvious when teaching methodologies developed in one educational context are exported to another educational context. This paper investigated the pedagogical communication problem between expatriate English language teachers and Chinese university English language majors. In transplanting Western educational models to Chinese classrooms, expatriate teachers had difficulties matching their discourse to the Chinese culture of learning and therefore did not achieve the desired outcomes as the Chinese students responded negatively to their teaching, especially the interactive approach which involves students in group work, discussions, debates, and games. There exists a vast gap between what expatriate teachers had intended and what Chinese students interpreted, all basing their respective interpretations on their cultural values, beliefs, perceptions, and role expectations without sharing a common agenda. The resolution to the problems, the paper proposes, lies in the establishment of a synergetic culture in which common interests are to be found and shared, sources of problems identified, cultural differences understood and respected, otherness transcended, and learning maximally enhanced.

Acknowledgements: I am very grateful to Dr. Howard Nicholas, Dr. Lloyd Holliday, and Dr. Audrey Grant for their views, comments, and suggestions.

References

Allwright, D. (1996). Social and pedagogic pressures in the language classroom: The role of socialization. In H. Coleman (Ed.), *Society and the language classroom* (pp. 209-228). Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

Austin, T. (1998). Cross-cultural pragmatics -- Building in analysis of communication across cultures and languages: Examples from Japanese. *Foreign Language Annals, 31* (3), 326-346.

Barna, L. M. (1991). Stumbling blocks in intercultural communication. In L. A. Samovar & R. E. Porter (Eds.), *Intercultural communication: A reader* (6th ed.) (pp. 345-352). Belmont, CA.: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Barrow, R. (1990). Culture, values and the language classroom. In B. Harrison (Ed.), *Culture and language classroom* (pp. 3-10). Hong Kong: Modern English publications and the British Council.

Booz, E. (1983). Teaching in Kunming: getting over the hump. *Asian Study, 23* (11), 1203-1208.

Brick, J. (1991). *China: A handbook in intercultural communication*. Sydney: National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research, Macquarie University.

Brislin, R. W. (1993). *Understanding culture's influence on behaviour*. New York: Harcourt Brace College.

Burnaby, B., & Sun, Y. L. (1989). Chinese teachers' views of Western language teaching: Context informs paradigms. *TESOL Quarterly, 23* (2), 219-238.

Caiger, J., Davies, B., Leigh, B., Orton, J., & Rice, A. (1996). Education. In A. Milner & M. Quilty (Eds.), *Australia in Asia: Comparing cultures* (pp. 69-103). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chang, B. G. (1996). *Deconstructing communication: Representation, subject, and economies of exchange*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Chang, H. C., Holt, G. R. (1994). A Chinese perspective on face as inter-relational concern. In S. Ting-Toomey (Ed.), *The challenge of facework: Cross-cultural and interpersonal issues* (pp. 95-132). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Chen, H. C. (1996). Chinese reading and comprehension: A cognitive psychology perspective. In M. H. Bond (Ed.), *The handbook of Chinese psychology* (pp. 43-62). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Coleman, H. (1996). Autonomy and ideology in English language classroom. In H. Coleman (Ed.), *Society and the language classroom* (pp. 1-15). Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

Cortazzi, M. (1990). Cultural and educational expectations in the language classroom. In B. Harrison (Ed.), *Culture and the language classroom* (pp. 54-65). Hong Kong: Modern English Publications and the British Council.

Cortazzi, M., & Jin, L. X. (1996). Cultures of learning: Language classrooms in China. In H. Coleman (Ed.), *Society and the language classroom* (pp. 169-206). Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

Craig, B. A. (1995). Boundary discourse and the authority of knowledge in the second-language classroom: A social-constructionist approach. In J. E. Alatis et al., (Eds.), *Georgetown University round table on languages and linguistics, 1995* (pp. 40-54). Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Edge, J. (1996). Cross-cultural paradoxes in a profession of values. *TESOL Quarterly, 30* (1), 9-30.

Ellsworth, E. (1997). *Teaching positions: Difference, pedagogy, and the power of address*. New York: Teachers College Pres.

Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *The Modern Language Journal, 81* (3), 285-300.

Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1998). SLA property: No trespassing! *The Modern Language Journal, 81* (1), 91-94.

Flowerdew, L. (1998). A cultural perspective on group work. *ELT Journal, 52* (4), 323-329.

Ford, D. J. (1988). *The twain shall meet: the current study of English in China.* Jefferson, North Carolina and London: McFarland & Company, Inc., Publishers.

Gadman, S. (1997). *Power partnering: A strategy for business excellence in the 21st century.* Boston: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Gardner, H. (1989). *To open minds: Chinese clues to the dilemma of contemporary education.* New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers.

Garrott, J. R. (1992). Preferences and pet peeves of Chinese college students. ED350 856 FL 020 681.

Garrott, J. R. (1995). Chinese cultural values: New angles, added insights. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 19* (2), 211-225.

Giroux, H. A. (1992). *Border crossing: Cultural workers and the politics of education.* New York: Routledge,Chapman and Hall, Inc.

Gudykunst, W. B. (1994). *Bridging differences: Effective intergroup communication* (2nd ed.). London: Sage Publications.

Hall, E. T. (1976). *Beyond culture.* New York: Anchor Press.

Hird, B. (1996). The incompatible objectives of group work in FL learning: A study of Chinese- English code-switching. *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 9* (2), 163-175.

Ho, J., & Crookall, D. (1995). Breaking with Chinese cultural traditions: Learner autonomy in English language teaching. *System, 23* (2), 235-243.

Hofstede, G. (1986). Cultural differences in teaching and learning. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 10,* 301-320.

Holliday, A. (1997). The politics of participation in international English language education. *System, 25* (3), 409-423.

Hong, P. Z. (1993). The benefit of studying Chinese/Asian type of education philosophy for Australia's education export. In R. Leach (Ed.), *National strategies for Australasian countries: the impact of the Asian/Pacific economy* (pp. 249-261). Queensland: Queensland University of Technology Production.

Hoosain, R. (1986) Perceptual process of the Chinese. In M. H. Bond (Ed.), *The psychology of Chinese people* (pp. 38-72). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *Modern Language Journal, 70* (1), 125-132.

Hui, C. H., & Triandis, H. C. (1986). Individualism-collectivism: A study of cross-cultural researchers. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Philosophy, 17* (2), 225-248.

Kramsch, C. (1994). *Context and culture in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Leung, K. (1996). The role of beliefs in Chinese culture. In M. H. Bond (Ed.), *The handbook of Chinese psychology* (pp. 247-262). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lewin, K., Xu, H., Little, A. W., & Zheng, J. W. (1994). *Educational innovation in China: Tracing the impact of the 1985 reforms*. Essex: Longman.

Li, M. S. (1998). Students' perceptions of teacher communication style in the use of pedagogies: A case study of expatriates teaching English in China. In J. Tapper & P. Gruba (Eds.), *ACSC '98 Teaching communication skills in the disciplines: The proceedings of the Australian Communication Skills Conference* (pp. 94-105). Melbourne: University of Melbourne, October 1-2, 1998.

Light, R., & Works, N. (1984). Training teachers across cultures: Report on a Fulbright Program in China. *World Language English, 3* (4), 269-278.

Lutz, R. (1990). Classroom shock: The role of expectations in an instructional setting. J. E. Alatis (Ed.), *Georgetown University Round Table on languages and linguistics, 1990* (pp. 144-156). Washington D. C.: Georgetown University Press.

Maley, A. (1986). XANADU -- A miracle of rare device: the teaching of English in China. In J. M. Valdes (Ed.), *Culture bound: Bridging the cultural gap in language teaching* (pp. 102-111). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McIlwraith, H. (1996). Managing conflict in ATTC Projects. *ELT Newsletter: Teaching English in China, 27*, 103-107.

McKnight, A. (1994). Chinese learners of English: A different view of literacy? *Open Letter, 4* (2), 34-52.

McLaughlin, D. (1995). Teaching overseas students and learning from them: A professional and modal dimension. *Educational Research and Perspectives, 22* (1), 103-113.

Murray, D. M.(1982). The great walls of China. *Today's Education, 71* (1), 55-58.

Nunan, D. (1995). Closing the gap between learning and instruction. *TESOL Quarterly, 29* (1), 133-158.

Nunan, D. (1996). Hidden voices: insiders' perspectives on classroom interaction. In K. M. Bailey & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Voices from the language classroom: Qualitative research in second language education* (pp. 41-56). Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

Orton, J. M. (1990). *Educating the reflective practitioner in China: a case study in teacher education.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, La Trobe University, Melbourne.

O'Sullivan, K. (1994). *Understanding ways: Communicating between cultures*. Sydney: Hale & Iremonger.

Paine, L. W. (1990). The teacher as virtuoso: A Chinese model for teaching. *Teachers College Record, 92* (1), 49-81.

Paine, L. W. (1992). Teaching and modernization in contemporary China. In R. Hayhoe (Ed.), *Education and modernization: the Chinese experience* (pp. 183-209). Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Pennycook, A. (1990). Critical Pedagogy and second language education. *System, 18* (3), 303-314.

Pennycook, A. (1994). *The cultural politics as an international language*. Essex, England: Longman.

Popkewitz, T. S. (1987). Ideology and social formation in teacher education. In T. S. Popkewitz (Ed.), *Critical studies in teacher education: Its folklore, theory and practice* (pp. 2-33). The Falmer Press.

Porter, E. A. (1990). *Foreign teachers in China: Old problems for a new generation, 1979-1989*. New York. London: Greenwood Press.

Rao, Z. H. (1996). Reconciling communicative approaches to the teaching of English with traditional Chinese methods. *Research in the Teaching of English, 30* (4), 458-471.

Riley, P. (1985). *Discourse and learning*. London: Longman.

Ryan, M. (1998). Cultural knowledge and foreign language teachers: A case study of native speaker of English and a native speaker of Spanish. *Language, culture and Curriculum, 11* (2), 135-153.

Sampson, G. P. (1984). Exporting language teaching methods from Canada to China. *TESL Canadian Journal, 1* (1), 19-32.

Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. W. (1995). *Intercultural communication: A discourse approach*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Sun, G. Y. (1990). English teaching in China. *ELT Newsletter: Teaching English in China, 21*, 76-82.

Triandis, H. (1994). *Culture and social behaviour*. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Tsui, A. B. M. (1996). Reticence and anxiety in second language learning. In K. M. Bailey & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Voices from the language classroom: Qualitative research in second language education* (pp. 145-167). Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

Wan, Z. X. (1997). Observation on teaching style of native-speaking teachers in Chinese ELT classrooms. *ELT Newsletter: Teaching English in China, 29*, 101-104.

Wen, Q. F., & Johnson, R. K. (1997). L2 learner variables and English achievement: A study of tertiary-level English majors in China. *Applied Linguistics, 18* (1), 27-48.

Widdowson, H. G. (1987). The roles of teacher and learner. *ELT Journal, 41* (2), 83-88.

Wright, T. (1987). *Roles of teachers and learners*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wright, T. (1990). Understanding classroom role relationships. In J. C. Richards & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Second language teacher education* (pp. 82-97). Cambridge: Cambridge University Pres.

Young, R. (1996). *Intercultural Communication: Pragmatics, genealogy, deconstruction*. Adelaide: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Yu, C. C. (1984). Cultural principles underlying English teaching in China. *Language Learning and Communication, 3* (1), 29-40.

Yum, J. O. (1988). The impact of Confucianism on interpersonal relationships and communication patterns in East Asia. *Communication Monographs, 55*, 374-388.

Zhang, Q. R. (1995). *A Unit in English as a foreign language in China: some implications for Australian EFL teachers*. Unpublished MA thesis, La Trobe University, Melbourne.